Issue Brief - Class Size Reduction

MINIMUM SCHOOL PROGRAM

NUMBER MSP 4

SUMMARY

Two programs within the Minimum School Program provide revenue towards class size reduction. Most often, class size is expressed in terms of pupil-to-teacher ratios. The pupil teacher ratio is often used to describe the 'average class size' for a state or school district, however the pupil teacher ratio is the number of students in a school, school district, or state compared to the total number of teaching professionals. This brief includes information on Utah's pupil teacher ratio, compares this ratio to other western states, and provides cost estimates to reduce the pupil teacher ratio in Utah.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Since Utah emerged from the budget downturn years of FY 2002 to FY 2004, class sizes in the State's public schools have emerged as a significant education budget issue. During the 2006 General Session, policymakers introduced legislation to allocate additional revenue for class size reduction. No class size reduction initiative emerged from the 2006 General Session.

Resuming the discussion on class size, the Governor recommended a class size reduction program for FY 2008. The STAR 20 (Student to Teaching Adult Ratio) establishes "a twenty student classroom learning environment in K-3rd grade with \$28,738,800 ongoing USF [Uniform School Fund Revenue]."

Similarly, the Utah State Board of Education has recommended two class size reduction initiatives. The Literacy and Math Achievement Program suggests decreasing K-12 literacy and math class sizes by one student per classroom each year for four years. The Utah State Office of Education estimates a total cost of \$28.7 million. The English Language Learner (ELL) Achievement Program is the second class size reduction program recommended by the State Board of Education. The Board recommends reducing the class size in classrooms with ELL students and providing academic interventions to ELL students to help them succeed.

Pupil Teacher Ratios

The National Center for Education Statistics defines the pupil teacher ratio as "the total reported students divided by the FTE classroom teachers." In FY 2005 (school year 2004-2005) Utah's pupil teacher ratio was the highest in the nation at 22.6. Vermont reported the lowest pupil teacher ratio at 11.3. The national average is 15.8.

The table titled "Pupil Teacher Ratios" compares pupil teacher ratios among the western states. Historically, Utah, Arizona, and California have the highest class sizes. Appendix A provides a more detailed look at staffing ratios in Utah for FY 2006.

Tuph Teacher Ratios								
Utah and the Western United States								
2004-2005								
Total Total Pupil Teach								
State	Students	Teachers	Ratio					
Utah	503,607	22,287	22.6					
Arizona	1,043,298	48,935	21.3					
California	6,441,557	305,969	21.1					
Colorado	765,976	45,165	17.0					
Idaho	256,084	14,269	17.9					
Montana	146,705	10,224	14.3					
Nevada	400,083	20,950	19.1					
New Mexico	326,102	21,730	15.0					
Oregon	552,322	27,431	20.1					
Washington	1,020,005	53,125	19.2					
Wyoming	84,733	6,657	12.7					
United States 956,762 60,598 15.8								
The state of the s								

Pupil Teacher Ratios

Source: National Center for Education Statistics. State Profiles. Based on Common Core of Data 2004-2005. Retrieved from: http://nces.ed.gov/programs/stateprofiles. Prepared by: Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst, January 2007.

¹ Governor Jon M. Huntsman, Jr. Budget Recommendations: Fiscal Year 2008, Fiscal Year 2007 Supplementals. December 12, 2006

Class Sizes

The Utah State Office of Education does collect some information from school districts on actual class sizes. For these reports, the USOE relies primarily on Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) school level reports. These reports provide average class sizes for a given school and are not combined into district or state level composite reports.

Each U-PASS School Performance Report provides school level class size data on the number of classes per grade level (K-6) or class type (secondary) and the average class size by grade or type for each school in the state. This information provides more useful class size data than the pupil teacher ratio, however because the information is not aggregated to the district level comparisons statewide become difficult. School districts may have differing classifications of certain classes — especially in secondary schools.

The "Average Class Size Comparisons" table provides the school-average class size by grade for selected Utah schools. Information provided in the table indicates the variations in class sizes among schools and provide some perspective to the pupil teacher ratios reported nationally.

Funding Programs

Two programs within the Minimum School Program focus on class size reduction, the Class Size Reduction program and the Board Leeway.

 Class Size Reduction – The Legislature began appropriating funding for class size reduction in 1994. Since 1994, the annual allocation for class size reduction has increased to more than \$79 million (H.B. 3, 2007 General Session).

Program funding is targeted for class size reduction efforts in Kindergarten through the 8th grade. School districts and charter schools receive program revenues on a formula basis. The formula distributes revenue on a WPU basis to school districts and charter schools based on their prior year K-8 ADM (student enrollment) plus student growth in grades K-8.

Fifty percent of program revenues must support class size reduction efforts in grades K-2. If the average class size in these grades falls below 18, districts and charter schools may seek State Board approval to use class size reduction funds in grades 3-8. Up to 20 percent of program funds

Average Class Size Comparisons							
Selected Utah Schools - 2005							
School District or Grade							
K 1 2 3 4 5							
Alpine - Aspen	20.8	25.0	25.0	18.8	30.0	30.0	27.0
Beaver - Minersville	20.0	21.0	18.0	17.0	13.0	13.0	9.0
Cache - Wellsville	24.3	24.6	23.6	24.6	20.6	29.3	
Daggett - Flaming Gorge	7.0	4.0		6.0	1.0	4.0	
Granite - Lincoln	22.5	26.0	24.6	19.5	19.3	19.3	19.6
Jordan - Draper	24.6	20.8	23.3	25.2	26.8	22.8	
Park City - Jeremy Ranch	20.8	23.0	23.6	26.2	24.0	24.8	
Rich - South Rich	15.0	10.0	12.0	14.0	16.0	17.0	
San Juan - Bluff	7.0	8.0	11.0	9.0	12.0	8.0	4.0
Tooele - Stansbury	18.1	26.0	25.8	24.6	27.2	31.5	30.0
Uintah - LaPoint	20.5	20.5	13.0	20.5	14.5	39.0	
Washington - Hurricane	20.0	21.3	21.3	21.3	24.6	21.0	
Weber - Municipal	15.0	24.5	21.6	26.5	23.5	33.0	31.5
Salt Lake - Riley	25.6	21.7	25.3	23.6	25.3	20.6	28.6
Ogden - Polk	24.6	29.6	24.6	23.3	31.0	24.6	
Provo - Provost	27.6	19.0	18.0	21.3	33.0	26.5	32.5
Logan - Bridger	21.2	25.3	22.4	20.6	29.0	26.0	
Timpanogos Academy	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	24.5	25.0
Ogden Prepartory Academy	12.5	12.5	8.3	8.3	13.0	13.0	12.5
Summit Academy	4.0	7.8	8.7	25.3	6.5	3.8	9.2
Freedom Academy							2.1
Source: Utah State Office of Education. January 2007.							

Prepared by: Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst. (01/07BL).

Minimum School Program

Annual Class Size Reduction Appropriations FY 1993 to FY 2007

Fiscal	Annual	Annual	Percent
Year	Appropriation	Change	Change
2007	\$74,378,341	\$4,215,901	6.0%
2006	70,162,440	4,259,494	6.5%
2005	65,902,946	1,925,396	3.0%
2004	63,977,550	535,626	0.8%
2003	63,441,924	856,992	1.4%
2002	62,584,932	3,253,470	5.5%
2001	59,331,462	3,105,585	5.5%
2000	56,225,877	8,385,261	17.5%
1999	47,840,616	1,528,938	3.3%
1998	46,311,678	1,344,616	3.0%
1997	44,967,062	26,334,294	141.3%
1996	18,632,768	3,181,496	20.6%
1995	15,451,272	4,398,174	39.8%
1994	11,053,098	6,663,558	151.8%
1993	4,389,540		
Total	\$704,651,506		

Source: Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst. Annual Appropriations Reports. 1993 to 2007.

may support capital facility projects. Rapidly growing districts/charters may use a higher percentage based on statutory provisions.

• Board Leeway – Local school boards must use revenue generated by the Board Leeway for class size reduction efforts. However, if a local school board determines that district class sizes are not excessive, it may seek authorization to use program revenue to support other district functions. School boards must declare in a public meeting, prior to levying the Board Leeway, that class sizes are not excessive. Statute also requires that school districts to certify to the State Board of Education that class size needs are being met and identify the other school related uses for Board Leeway revenues before the district can use any revenue generated from the tax.

Estimated Board Leeway Revenue								
	2006-2008							
School Revenue P								
Year	State	State Local Total						
2005-06	\$4,527,413	\$43,757,326	\$48,284,739					
2006-07	6,547,704	47,977,038	54,524,742	12.9%				
2007-08	9,782,744	52,402,304	62,185,048	14.0%				
Source: Utah State Office of Education, Finance and Statistics. Estimated Board								
Leeways. 20	006-2008.							

Class Size Reduction Cost estimates

Estimates to reduce class size vary depending on the targeted outcome desired. Due to the lack of reliable standardized data on actual class size, most cost estimates to reduce class size use pupil teacher ratios. In reality, class size reduction cost estimates are really estimates on the cost to reduce the pupil teacher ratio. The Governor's STAR 20 initiative uses a student to teaching adult ratio.

During the 2006 General Session, the Utah State Office of Education produced a cost estimate to reduce the pupil teacher ratio in grades K-3 to 20 students per teacher. The USOE estimated reduction costs at \$36.3 million for additional teachers, \$396 million for additional school facilities, and \$6.9 million for district and school level administrative costs. The pupil teacher reduction cost estimate totaled more than \$439 million.

Following this same framework, the Analyst has produced a similar pupil teacher ratio reduction cost estimate. The table below details this cost estimate. The table provides two scenarios, reducing Utah's pupil teacher ratio by one and reducing it to the national average of 15.8. Further, the estimate differentiates the teacher costs by providing two estimates, one for average beginning teacher compensation and the second for statewide average teacher compensation.

The estimate indicates that it may cost between \$45.5 million and \$57.6 million to reduce Utah's pupil teacher ratio by one. Further, it may cost \$399.9 to \$506.2 million to reduce Utah's pupil teacher ratio to the national average. These estimates include only the teacher compensation related portions of the cost estimate. Capital facility costs, as well as school and district level administration costs, generally fall to the local school districts. Including these costs in the estimate increases the total cost of pupil-teacher ratio reductions significantly. To reduce the pupil-teacher ratio by one, these scenarios indicate that costs increase to \$560.7 million to \$572.8 million.

Utah Pupil-Teacher Ratio Reduction

Cost Estimates to Reduce Utah's Pupil Teacher Ratio by One & to the National Average

Cost Estimates to Reduce Utan's Pupil Teacher Ratio by One	& to the Nationa	i Average
	Reduce	Reduce to
	by One	National Avg.
Target Pupil-Teacher Ratio 2004-05:	21.4	15.8
Utah Pupil-Teacher Ratio 2004-05:	22.4	22.4
Difference:	1.0	6.6
Teachers		
Total FTE Teachers in Utah 2004-05:	22,090	22,090
Total Enrollment in Utah 2004-05:	495,298	495,298
Compensation		
Utah Average Beginning Teacher Compensation (Estimated):	\$43,196	\$43,196
Utah Average Teacher Compensation:	\$54,687	\$54,687
Required Number of Teachers		
New FTE Teachers Needed for Target Ratio:	1,055	9,258
Total FTE Teachers Required for Target Ratio:	23,145	31,348
Estimated Compensation Cost		
Estimated FTE Teacher Cost - Beginning Compensation:	\$45,561,687	\$399,907,474
Estimated FTE Teacher Cost - Average Compensation:	\$57,682,008	\$506,290,862
Facility Estimates (Based on Elementary School Cost Estimates)		
Estimated FTE Teachers Per School:	25	25
Total New Schools Required to Accommodate a 15.8 Ratio:	42	370
Estimated Cost of New Elementary School:	\$12,000,000	\$12,000,000
Total Estimated Facility Costs:	\$506,287,850	\$4,443,827,848
School & District Administration Estimates (per School)		
School Level Administration:	\$179,400	\$179,400
District Administration:	\$30,800	\$30,800
Total Estimated Administration per School:	\$210,200	\$210,200
Total Estimated School & District Administration Cost:	\$8,868,476	\$77,841,051
	+ = , = = ,	+ ,
Total Estimated Pupil-Teacher Ratio Reduction Costs	φε <i>ζ</i> ο 710 013	Φ4 001 57 C 07 4
Beginning Compensation	\$560,718,013	\$4,921,576,374
Average Compensation	\$572,838,334	\$5,027,959,761
Sources: Utah State Office of Education, Staffing Ratios (Utah). National C	Center for Education	on Statistics (US).
Prepared by: Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst (01/07BL).		

JANUARY 18, 2007, 10:25 AM

APPENDIX A

Staffing Ratios FY2006

			All K-12	Special					
Local Education	Elementary	Secondary	Classroom	Education	All	Elementary	Secondardy	School	School
Agencies	Teachers (K-6)	Teachers (7-12)	Teachers	Teachers	Teachers	Counselors	Counselors	Nurses*	Administrators
DISTRICT									
Alpine	25.53	28.89	26.88	5.82	24.81	[3]	376.10	4,115.85	551.61
Beaver	23.53	21.39	22.53	3.12	21.08	[3]	336.00	[3]	343.67
Box Elder	24.07	24.31	24.18	3.63	21.86	11,190.00	322.07	5,213.00	444.08
Cache	26.73	23.93	25.42	3.21	23.40	[3]	408.35	8,840.67	473.61
Carbon	22.57	21.83	22.19	5.43	19.64	971.86	250.08	4,918.18	295.09
Daggett	15.52	10.70	13.03	[2]	12.26	[3]	[3]	1,560.00	346.67
Davis	26.31	23.87	25.16	5.37	23.18	1,131.22	411.00	4,842.22	519.25
Duchesne	19.68	18.42	19.06	8.45	17.94	[3]	[3]	6,325.00	298.82
Emery	20.98	20.04	20.51	2.26	18.82	[3]	2,284.00	3,078.67	243.05
Garfield	18.16	14.39	16.16	4.86	15.19	878.18	507.06	1,828.00	184.65
Grand	19.25	18.17	18.72	6.11	17.38	[3]	337.00	14,150.00	283.00
Granite	26.01	21.14	23.56	5.84	21.75	18,427.50	326.33	4,310.40	476.96
Iron	26.16	23.36	24.87	4.16	22.58	1,144.50	409.88	4,031.00	497.65
Jordan	27.33	26.03	26.73	7.83	25.00	41,315.00	462.82	75,147.00	474.89
Juab	23.06	25.76	24.18	5.42	22.25	[3]	424.75	3,807.84	308.25
Kane	21.05	15.47	18.00	2.93	16.77	[3]	368.67	1,177.00	339.19
Logan	23.82	20.11	22.01	3.45	20.09	[3]	324.39	7,513.33	414.34
Millard	21.94	17.95	19.79	5.38	18.56	952.10	1,050.75	4,112.86	295.59
Morgan	24.54	21.02	22.71	3.33	21.13	[3]	995.88	8,012.00	461.52
Murray	22.94	23.76	23.33	5.50	21.78	1,817.78	381.88	3,163.50	421.80
Nebo	27.17	25.17	26.31	5.84	24.09	1,876.13	423.42	3,706.46	522.60
North Sanpete	20.59	19.69	20.17	3.84	18.89	[3]	[3]	4,568.00	304.53
North Summit	21.02	19.48	20.27	1.46	17.92	1,032.00	304.00	1,944.00	265.57
Ogden	25.51	21.29	23.55	6.05	21.57	537.24	411.27	[3]	380.92
Park City	21.35	17.39	19.27	4.53	18.17	451.40	310.48	2,143.00	428.60
Piute	16.05	10.06	12.49	3.94	12.06	469.70	417.65	990.00	230.23
Provo	23.94	22.50	23.28	5.68	20.86	[3]	496.78	2,839.33	497.93
Rich	13.69	12.93	13.29	2.50	12.63	400.00	468.89	3,161.54	208.63
Salt Lake San Juan	23.33 19.75	21.85 13.92	22.70 16.27	5.82 1.95	20.54 14.94	1,076.76 4,254.55	383.95 425.80	3,362.79 1,436.50	481.41 207.74
Sevier		20.60	22.81	2.65			538.33	,	340.14
South Sanpete	25.10 22.84	20.60 17.16	22.81 19.71	2.65 3.41	20.25 18.29	3,729.95 [3]	325.75	4,217.00 5,438.00	340.14 247.18
South Summit	20.24	19.66	19.71	3.16	19.07	725.00	404.67	1,332.00	333.00
Tintic	13.61	12.47	13.01	1.18	12.12	675.00	342.50	[3]	201.48
Tooele	25.26	23.54	24.53	5.58	22.40	2,282.33	419.55	5,731.00	446.06
Uintah	21.90	22.67	22.23	4.02	19.80	[3]	240.95	8,981.67	359.27
Wasatch	28.09	19.40	23.52	3.91	21.31	1,060.00	374.11	5,618.67	413.14
Washington	23.69	23.39	23.56	3.79	21.51	1,198.13	343.07	846.63	487.08
Wayne	18.78	12.19	15.12	2.26	14.03	[3]	[3]	3,168.75	260.00
Weber	24.84	26.13	25.42	5.53	22.91	916.97	319.18	2,624.37	472.83
DISTRICT TOTAL	25.24	23.36	24.37	5.52	22.40	314.19	389.85	3,969.14	458.86
CHARTER TOTAL	24.21	19.95	22.39	4.30	21.67	10,559.70	312.91	1,978.72	474.72
STATE TOTAL	25.22	23.28	24.32	5.51	22.39	2,355.34	387.96	3,879.36	459.21

- [1] Reported students, but did not assign teachers in this category.[2] Assigned teachers, but did not report any students in this category.
- [3] No personnel assigned for this category.

*Includes nurses employed by the LEA and contracted by the Health Department.

Source: Utah State Office of Education, Finance and Statistics Section. January 2007.